



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/024,681	12/18/2001	Rajiv Manucha	130-0002US	2931
29855	7590	12/16/2004		
WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, P.C. 20333 SH 249 SUITE 600 HOUSTON, TX 77070			EXAMINER KINDRED, ALFORD W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2163	

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/024,681

Applicant(s)

MANUCHA ET AL.

Examiner

Alford W. Kindred

Art Unit

2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment A, filed 6/24/04.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communication: Amendment filed on 6/24/04.

This action is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-11, 13-17, and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hancock et al., US# 2003/0009361 A1 in view of Dutta et al., US# 2003/0061058 A1.

As per claim 1, Hancock et al. teaches "a database of records relating to a plurality of shipments of goods . . . a first jurisdiction and a second jurisdiction" (see page 3, paragraphs [0039]-[0041]) "a database server in communication . . ." (see page 4, paragraph [0056]) "a user interface . . . member of a supply chain . . ." (see page 9, paragraphs [0126]-[0127]) "each member to modify at least a portion of a record . . . goods" (see page 13, paragraphs [0198]-[0207]). Hancock et al. does not explicitly teach "data required to export a product . . . data required to import a product". Dutta et al. teaches "data required to export a product . . . data required to import a product" (see paragraphs [0045] and [0051]). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to have combined the teachings of Hancock and Dutta

import a product”, would given those skilled in the art the tools to render required information in regards to the processing of import and export elements. This gives users the advantage of receiving information regarding the actual processing of data during the importing and exporting of products more efficiently.

As per claim 2, Hancock et al. teaches “wherein said application server only allows a particular one of said members to modify said at least a portion of aid record . . .” (see page 13, paragraphs [0198]-[0206]).

As per claim 3, Hancock et al. teaches “an electronic interchange server in communication with said database server” (see page 4, paragraph [0056]).

As per claim 4, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1 and 3 and are similarly rejected.

As per claim 5, Hancock et al. teaches “allows access to database maintained by governments of said jurisdictions” (see page 3, paragraphs [0039]-[0041]).

As per claims 6-7, Hancock et al. teaches “a file transfer protocol server for enabling receipt and transmission of said records using the file transfer protocol” (see pages 8 and 9, paragraphs [0118]-[0119]).

As per claim 8, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-2 and are similarly rejected.

As per claim 9, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1 and 4-5 and is similarly rejected including the following:

--Hancock et al. teaches "a query for information stored in database . . ." (see pages 12-13, paragraphs [0192] and [0214]).

As per claims 10-11, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1 and 5 and are similarly rejected.

As per claims 13-16, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1-2 and are similarly rejected.

As per claim 17, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to arguments given above for rejected claim 9 and is similarly rejected.

As per claims 19-21, these claims are rejected on grounds corresponding to the arguments given above for rejected claims 1, 8 and 4 are similarly rejected including the following:

Hancock et al. teaches "first metric derived from data in a database . . ." (see page 9, paragraphs [0121]-[0126]).

As per claim 20, Hancock et al. teaches "a table for shipment identities . . . consolidation information . . . shipment information . . ." (see fig. 9b—sheet 13 of 26 and fig. 9c—sheet 14 of 26) "economic transaction information . . . detail information . . . customs entry information . . ." (see page 3, paragraphs [0039]-[0041]) "classification information . . . government department information" (see fig. 4—sheet 4 of 26 and page 3, paragraphs [0039]-[0041]).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11, 13-17, and 19-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments filed 6/24/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per applicant's arguments regarding claim 22 "examiner has only identified information in Hancock related to seven of the ten tables . . .", examiner maintains that the seven specified tables in Hancock includes all of the functionalities of applicant's ten tables, both sets of tables accomplish the same goal of identifying shipments and documents associated with those identified shipments. Therefore, the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alford W. Kindred whose telephone number is 571-272-4037. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 9:00 am- 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (571) 272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2163

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Alford W. Kindred', is positioned above the printed name.

Alford W. Kindred
Patent Examiner
Tech Ctr. 2100